arXiv:1402.7211v1 [math.CT] 28 Feb 2014

CONSTRUCTING COGENERATORS IN TRIANGULATED CATEGORIES AND BROWN REPRESENTABILITY

GEORGE CIPRIAN MODOI

Abstract. For a triangulated category with products we prove a formal criterion in order to satisfy Brown representability for covariant functors. We apply this criterion for showing that both homotopy category of projective modules and homotopy category of projective complexes satisfy this kind of representability.

Introduction

Brown representability theorem is an old and venerable subject. Perhaps its importance comes from the fact that it is a tool for producing adjoints for triangulated functors. Let be more specific: Consider a triangulated category $\mathcal{T}$. The standard reference for triangulated categories is [10]. A (co)homological functor on $\mathcal{T}$ is a (contravariant) functor $F : \mathcal{T} \to \mathcal{A}$ into an abelian category which sends triangles to long exact sequences. If $\mathcal{T}$ has (co)products, then Brown representability for covariant (contravariant) functors means that all (co)homological product–preserving (which sends coproducts into products) functors $\mathcal{T} \to \mathcal{A}b$ are naturally isomorphic to $\mathcal{T}(X, -)$ (respectively to $\mathcal{T}(-, X)$) for some $X \in \mathcal{T}$. Clearly these concepts are dual to each other. From historical reasons, first result of this type being proved by Brown in [2] for homotopy category of spectra, Brown representability for contravariant functors is also called (direct) Brown representability and that for covariant functors is called dual; we shall also say $\mathcal{T}$, respectively $\mathcal{T}^o$, satisfies Brown representability. It is straightforward to check that if $\mathcal{T}$ ($\mathcal{T}^o$) satisfies Brown representability, then every triangulated functor $\mathcal{T} \to \mathcal{T}'$ which preserves coproducts (products) has a right (left) adjoint.

Remark that Brown representability for covariant functors is better understood than its dual. About the usual triangulated categories we know if they satisfy or not this property. For example, derived category of a Grothendieck abelian category (including derived category of modules or of quasicoherent sheaves) are α-compactly generated for a regular cardinal α in the sense of [10, Definition 8.1.6] (note that Neeman calls such categories well generated). Consequently they are localizations of a compactly generated triangulated category, hence they satisfy Brown representability for contravariant functors. In contrast, the homotopy category of an additive

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 18E30, 16D90, 55U35.

Key words and phrases. Brown representability, homotopy category, projective module, projective complex.

This work was supported by a grant CNCS-UEFISCDI, project number PN-II-ID-PCE-2012-4-0100.

category does not satisfy Brown representability, unless the initial additive category is pure–semisimple (see [9]).

Even if Brown representability for covariant functors holds in compactly generated triangulated categories, by a result proved by Neeman in [10, Theorem 8.6.1], this property is not preserved by passing to localizations. Therefore one of the most challenging problem left open in Neeman's book is if for a regular cardinal $\alpha > \aleph_0$, an α-compactly generated triangulated category satisfies Brown representability for covariant functors. This paper belongs to a suite of works concerned with this subject. In [5] is given a criterion for Brown representability for contravariant functors which is dualized in [6], where it is shown that if $\mathcal{T}^o$ is deconstractible then $\mathcal{T}$ satisfies Brown representability for covariant functors (see Proposition 1.1 here). The paper [7] applies this dual version for derived categories of a class of Grothendieck categories. In the paper [8] it is observed that Neeman arguments in [14] used to construct cogenerators in the homotopy category of projective modules may be modified and adapted in order to show that the dual of this category is deconstructible. Here we formalize this approach. Fortunately the general results which we obtained (Theorem 1.5 and Corollaries 1.6 and 1.7) may be applied not only to recover the main result in [8] (see Theorem 2.1), but also to generalizes a formal criterion by Krause for Brown representability for covariant functors (Corollary 1.8) and to show that homotopy category of projective complexes satisfies this property (Theorem 2.4). We also note that there is no known example of a triangulated category which is not compactly generated and satisfies the hypothesis of Krause's criterion and, as we have seen, for compactly generated case there are another proofs available. In contrast, our criterion applies for cases of triangulated categories which are decidedly not compactly generated. Indeed, by [14, Facts 2.8], the homotopy category of projective right modules over a ring which is not left coherent has to be only $\aleph_1$-compactly generated.

1. A criterion for Brown representability for covariant functors

Let $\mathcal{T}$ be a triangulated category and denote by Σ its suspension functor. Let $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathcal{T}$ be a set of objects. We put

$$\mathcal{S}^{\perp} = \{X \in \mathcal{T} \mid \mathcal{T}(S, X) = 0 \text{ for all } S \in \mathcal{S}\},$$

$$^{\perp}\mathcal{S} = \{X \in \mathcal{T} \mid \mathcal{T}(X, S) = 0 \text{ for all } S \in \mathcal{S}\}.$$

Sometimes we write shortly $X \in \mathcal{S}^{\perp}$ if and only if $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{S}, X) = \{0\}$, and dual for the left hand perpendicular. We say that $\mathcal{S}$ is Σ-*stable* if it is closed under suspensions and desuspensions, that is $\Sigma\mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathcal{S}$ and $\Sigma^{-1}\mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathcal{S}$.

In definitions and remarks made in this paragraph we need $\mathcal{T}$ to be closed under coproducts for the direct notion and to be closed under products for the dual one. Recall that we say that the set of objects $\mathcal{S}$ *generates* $\mathcal{T}$ if $\mathcal{S}^{\perp} = \{0\}$. Dually $\mathcal{S}$ *cogenerates* $\mathcal{T}$ if $^{\perp}\mathcal{S} = \{0\}$. A *(co)localizing subcategory* of $\mathcal{T}$ is a triagulated subcategory which is closed under coproducts (respectively products). For $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathcal{T}$ we denote $\mathrm{Loc}(\mathcal{S})$ and $\mathrm{Coloc}(\mathcal{S})$ the smallest (co)localizing subcategory containing $\mathcal{S}$. It is obtained as the intersection of all (co)localizing subcategories which contain $\mathcal{S}$. Note that

if $\mathcal{S}$ is Σ-stable, then $\mathcal{S}^{\perp}$ (respectively ${}^{\perp}\mathcal{S}$) is a (co)localizing subcategory. Moreover if $\mathcal{S}$ is Σ-stable and $\mathcal{T} = \mathrm{Loc}(\mathcal{S})$ then $\mathcal{S}$ generates $\mathcal{T}$, and dually $\mathcal{T} = \mathrm{Coloc}(\mathcal{S})$ implies $\mathcal{S}$ cogenerates $\mathcal{T}$. Indeed, if we suppose $\mathcal{S}^{\perp} \neq \{0\}$, then ${}^{\perp}(\mathcal{S}^{\perp})$ is localizing subcategory containing $\mathcal{S}$ strictly smaller than $\mathcal{T}$.

From now on, in this section we fix $\mathcal{T}$ to be a triangulated category with products. The first ingredient in the proof of the main theorem of this paper is contained in [6]. Here we recall it shortly. If

$$X_1 \leftarrow X_2 \leftarrow X_3 \leftarrow \cdots$$

is an inverse tower (indexed over $\mathbb{N}$) of objects in $\mathcal{T}$, then its homotopy limit is defined (up to a non–canonical isomorphism) by the triangle

$$\varprojlim X_n \longrightarrow \prod_{n\in\mathbb{N}^*} X_n \overset{1-shift}{\longrightarrow} \prod_{n\in\mathbb{N}^*} X_n \longrightarrow \Sigma(\varprojlim X_n),$$

(see [10, dual of Definition 1.6.4]).

Consider again a set of objects in $\mathcal{T}$ and denote it by $\mathcal{S}$. We define $\mathrm{Prod}(\mathcal{S})$ to be the full subcategory of $\mathcal{T}$ consisting of all direct factors of products of objects in $\mathcal{S}$. Next we define inductively $\mathrm{Prod}_1(\mathcal{S}) = \mathrm{Prod}(\mathcal{S})$ and $\mathrm{Prod}_n(\mathcal{S})$ is the full subcategory of $\mathcal{T}$ which consists of all objects Y lying in a triangle $X \to Y \to Z \to \Sigma X$ with $X \in \mathrm{Prod}_1(\mathcal{S})$ and $Y \in \mathrm{Prod}_n(\mathcal{S})$. Clearly the construction leads to an ascending chain $\mathrm{Prod}_1(\mathcal{S}) \subseteq \mathrm{Prod}_2(\mathcal{S}) \subseteq \cdots$. Supposing $\mathcal{S}$ to be Σ-stable, the same is true for $\mathrm{Prod}_n(\mathcal{S})$, by [11, Remark 07]. The same [11, Remark 07] says, in addition, that if $X \to Y \to Z \to \Sigma X$ is a triangle with $X \in \mathrm{Prod}_n(\mathcal{S})$ and $\mathrm{Prod}_m(\mathcal{S})$ then $Z \in \mathrm{Prod}_{n+m}(\mathcal{S})$. An object $X \in \mathcal{T}$ will be called $\mathcal{S}$-*cofiltered* if it may be written as a homotopy limit $X \cong \varprojlim X_n$ of an inverse tower, with $X_1 \in \mathrm{Prod}_1(\mathcal{S})$, and X_{n+1} lying in a triangle $P_n \to X_{n+1} \to X_n \to \Sigma P_n$, for some $P_n \in \mathrm{Prod}_1(\mathcal{S})$. Inductively we have $X_n \in \mathrm{Prod}_n(\mathcal{S})$, for all $n \in \mathbb{N}^*$. The dual notion must surely be called *filtered*, and the terminology comes from the analogy with the filtered objects in an abelian category (see [3, Definition 3.1.1]). Using further the same analogy, we say that $\mathcal{T}$ (respectively, $\mathcal{T}^o$) is *deconstructible* if $\mathcal{T}$ has coproducts (products) and there is a Σ-stable set $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathcal{T}$, which is not a proper class such that every object $X \in \mathcal{T}$ is $\mathcal{S}$-filtered (cofiltered). Note that we may define deconstructibility without assuming Σ-stability. Indeed if every $X \in \mathcal{T}$ is $\mathcal{S}$-(co)filtered, then it is also $\overline{\mathcal{S}}$-(co)filtered, where $\overline{\mathcal{S}}$ is the closure of $\mathcal{S}$ under Σ and Σ^{-1}.

Proposition 1.1. [6, Theorem 8] *If $\mathcal{T}^o$ is deconstructible, then $\mathcal{T}^o$ satisfies Brown representability.*

In the next paragraph we shall work with ideals, so we recall their definition: An *ideal* in an additive category $\mathcal{A}$ is a collection of morphisms which is closed under addition and composition with arbitrary morphisms in $\mathcal{A}$. The *s-st power* of an ideal $\mathcal{I}$ denoted $\mathcal{I}^s$, where $s \in \mathbb{N}^*$ is the ideal generated (that is the closure under addition) of the set

$$\{f \mid \text{there are } f_1, \ldots, f_s \in \mathcal{I} \text{ such that } f = f_1 \cdots f_s\}.$$

If $\mathcal{I}$ and $\mathcal{J}$ are ideals, then to show that $\mathcal{I}^s \subseteq \mathcal{J}$ it is obviusly enough to show that the generators $f = f_1 \cdots f_s$ lie in $\mathcal{J}$. From now on $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathcal{T}$ is a Σ-stable set. We call $\mathcal{S}$-*(co)phantom* a map $\phi : X \to Y$ with the property $\mathcal{T}(S, \phi) = 0$

(respectively $\mathcal{T}(\phi, S) = 0$), for all $S \in \mathcal{S}$. Observe that $\phi : X \to Y$ is a phantom if and only if for every map $S \to X$ with $S \in \mathcal{S}$, the composite map $S \to X \xrightarrow{\phi} Y$ vanishes, and dual for a cophantom. We denote

$$\Phi(\mathcal{S}) = \{\phi \mid \phi \text{ is an } \mathcal{S}\text{-phantom}\} \text{ and } \Psi(\mathcal{S}) = \{\psi \mid \phi \text{ is an } \mathcal{S}\text{-cophantom.}\}$$

Clearly $\Phi(\mathcal{S})$ and $\Psi(\mathcal{S})$ are Σ-stable ideals in $\mathcal{T}$, that is they are also closed under Σ and Σ^{-1}. Clearly above defined ideals depend on the ambiental category $\mathcal{T}$. If we want to emphasize this dependence we shall write $\Phi_{\mathcal{T}}(\mathcal{S})$, respectively $\Psi_{\mathcal{T}}(\mathcal{S})$.

For stating the following Lemma we need to recall what a preenvelope is: If $\mathcal{A}' \subseteq \mathcal{A}$ is a full subcategory of any category $\mathcal{A}$, then a map $Y \to Z$ in $\mathcal{A}$ with $Z \in \mathcal{A}'$ is called a *$\mathcal{A}'$-preenvelope of Y*, provided that every other map $Y \to Z'$ with $Z' \in \mathcal{A}'$ factors through $Y \to Z$.

Lemma 1.2. *If $\mathcal{C}$ is a set of objects in $\mathcal{T}$ then every $Y \in \mathcal{T}$ has a* $\mathrm{Prod}(\mathcal{C})$*–preenvelope $Y \to Z$. Moreover if $\mathcal{C}$ is also Σ-stable, then this preenveope fits in a triangle $X \xrightarrow{\psi} Y \to Z \to \Sigma X$, with $\psi \in \Psi(\mathcal{C})$.*

Proof. The argument is standard: Let $Z = \prod_{S \in \mathcal{S}, \alpha : Y \to S} S$ and $Y \to Z$ the unique map making commutative the diagram:



where $p_{S,\alpha}$ is the canonical projection for all $S \in \mathcal{S}$ and all $\alpha : Y \to S$. If we complete this map to a triangle

$$X \xrightarrow{\psi} Y \to Z \to X[1]$$

and $\mathcal{C}$ is Σ-stable, then it may be immediately seen that the condition to be a $\mathrm{Prod}(\mathcal{S})$–preenvelope is equivalent to $\psi \in \Psi(\mathcal{S})$. □

Lemma 1.3. *Assume that $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathcal{T}$ and $\mathcal{G} \subseteq \mathcal{T}$ are two Σ-stable sets, such that there is $s \in \mathbb{N}^*$ with the property $\Psi(\mathcal{S})^s \subseteq \Phi(\mathcal{G})$. Then every $Y \in \mathcal{T}$ fits in a triangle $X \xrightarrow{\phi} Y \to Z \to \Sigma X$, with $Z \in \mathrm{Prod}_s(\mathcal{C})$ and $\phi \in \Phi(\mathcal{G})$.*

Proof. We begin with an inductive construction. First denote $X_1 = Y$, and if X_k is already constructed, $k \in \mathbb{N}^*$, then use Lemma 1.2 to construct the triangle

$$X_{k+1} \xrightarrow{\psi_k} X_k \to P_k \to \Sigma X_{k+1},$$

where $X_k \to P_k$ is a $\mathrm{Prod}(\mathcal{C})$–preenvelope of X_k and $\psi_k \in \Psi(\mathcal{C})$. Define also $\psi^1 = 1_Y : X_1 \to Y$, and $\psi^{k+1} = \psi^k \psi_k : X_{k+1} \to Y$ and complete them to triangles $X_k \xrightarrow{\psi^k} Y \to Z_k \to \Sigma X_k$, for all $k \in \mathbb{N}^*$. The octahedral axiom allows us to construct the commutative diagram whose rows and columns

are triangles:



We have $Z_1 = 0$, $Z_2 \cong P_1 \in \mathrm{Prod}(\mathcal{C})$ and the triangle in the second column of the above diagram allows us to complete the induction step in order to show that $Z_{k+1} \in \mathrm{Prod}_k(\mathcal{C})$. Clearly we also have $\psi^{k+1} \in \Psi(\mathcal{C})^k$, thus the desired triangle is $X_{s+1} \overset{\psi^{s+1}}{\longrightarrow} Y \longrightarrow Z_{s+1} \longrightarrow \Sigma X_{s+1}$. □

Lemma 1.4. *Assume that $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathcal{T}$ and $\mathcal{G} \subseteq \mathcal{T}$ are two Σ-stable sets, such that there is $s \in \mathbb{N}^*$ with the property $\Psi(\mathcal{S})^s \subseteq \Phi(\mathcal{G})$. Then every map $Y \to Z$ in $\mathcal{T}$ with $Z \in \mathrm{Prod}_n(\mathcal{S})$ factors as $Y \to Z' \to Z$, where $Z' \in \mathrm{Prod}_{n+s}(\mathcal{S})$ and the induced maps*

$$\mathcal{T}(G, Y) \to \mathcal{T}(G, Z) \text{ and } \mathcal{T}(G, Z') \to \mathcal{T}(G, Z)$$

have the same image, for all $G \in \mathcal{G}$.

Proof. Complete $Y \to Z$ to a triangle $Y \to Z \to Y' \to Y[1]$ and let

$$X \overset{\phi}{\to} Y' \to Z'' \to \Sigma X,$$

with $\phi \in \Phi(\mathcal{G})$ and $Z'' \in \mathrm{Prod}_s(\mathcal{C})$ the triangle whose existence is proved in Lemma 1.3. Complete the composed map $Z \to Y' \to Z''$ to a triangle

$$Z' \to Z \to Z'' \to Z'[1].$$

It is clear that $Z' \in \mathrm{Prod}_{n+s}(\mathcal{S})$. We can construct the commutative diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} Y & \longrightarrow & Z & \longrightarrow & Y' & \longrightarrow & \Sigma Y \\ \downarrow & & \| & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ Z' & \longrightarrow & Z & \longrightarrow & Z'' & \longrightarrow & \Sigma Z' \end{array}$$

by completing the middle square with $Y \to Z'$ to a morphism of triangles. Applying the functor $\mathcal{T}(G, -)$ with an arbitrary $G \in \mathcal{C}$ we get a commutative diagram with exact rows:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} \mathcal{T}(G,Y) & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{T}(G,Z) & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{T}(G,Y') \\ \downarrow & & \| & & \downarrow \\ \mathcal{T}(G,Z') & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{T}(G,Z) & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{T}(G,Z'') \end{array}$$

Since $\phi \in \Phi(\mathcal{G})$ we deduce $\mathcal{T}(G, Y') \to \mathcal{T}(G, Z'')$ is injective, so the kernels of the two right hand parallel arrows are the same. But these kernels coincide to the images of the two left hand parallel arrows. □

A diagram of triangulated categories and functors of the form $\mathcal{L} \stackrel{I}{\to} \mathcal{T} \stackrel{Q}{\to} U$ is called a *localization sequence* if I is fully faithful, $\operatorname{Ker} Q = \operatorname{Im} I$ and I has a right adjoint. By [10, Proposition 1.9.18] this is equivalent to the fact that Q has a right adjoint, and by [10, Theorem 1.9.16] this right adjoint has to be also fully faithful and to make $\mathcal{U}$ equivalent to the category $(\operatorname{Im} I)^{\perp}$.

Theorem 1.5. *Let $\mathcal{G} \subseteq \mathcal{T}$ a Σ-stable set and denote $\mathcal{U} = \left(\mathcal{G}^{\perp}\right)^{\perp}$. Suppose that there is a Σ-stable set $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathcal{U}$ and an integer $s \in \mathbb{N}^*$ such that $\Psi(\mathcal{C})^s \subseteq \Phi(\mathcal{G})$. Then $\mathcal{U} = \operatorname{Coloc}(\mathcal{C})$, there is a localization sequence $\mathcal{G}^{\perp} \to \mathcal{T} \to \mathcal{U}$ and $\mathcal{U}^o$ satisfies Brown representability.*

Proof. Fix $Y \in \mathcal{T}$. Construct as in Lemma 1.3 a triangle $X_1 \stackrel{\phi_1}{\to} Y \to Z_1 \to \Sigma X_1$, with $Z_1 \in \operatorname{Prod}_s(\mathcal{S})$ and $\phi_1 \in \Phi(\mathcal{G})$. We use Lemma 1.4 in order to construct inductively the maps $Y \to Z_n$, with $Z_n \in \operatorname{Prod}_{sn}(\mathcal{S})$, $n \in \mathbb{N}^*$, such that every $Y \to Z_n$ factors as $Y \to Z_{n+1} \to Z_n$, with the abelian group homomorphisms $\mathcal{T}(G, Y) \to \mathcal{T}(G, Z_n)$ and $\mathcal{T}(G, Z_{n+1}) \to \mathcal{T}(G, Z_n)$ having the same image, for all $G \in \mathcal{G}$. From now the argument runs as in the proof of [14, Theorem 4.7]. We recall it here for the reader convenience: Fix $G \in \mathcal{G}$. We obtain the commutative diagram of abelian groups

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
\mathcal{T}(G,Y) & = & \mathcal{T}(G,Y) & = & \mathcal{T}(G,Y) & = & \cdots \\
\downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \\
\mathcal{T}(G,Z_1) & \leftarrow & \mathcal{T}(G,Z_2) & \leftarrow & \mathcal{T}(G,Z_3) & \leftarrow & \cdots
\end{array}$$

with the first (hence all) vertical map(s) injective, and the images of both maps ending in each $\mathcal{T}(G, Z_n)$, $n \in \mathbb{N}^*$, coincide. This shows that the bellow tower is the direct sum of the above one and a tower with vanishing connecting maps, hence it has exact inverse limit and we obtain a short exact sequence:

$$0 \to \lim \mathcal{T}(G, Z_n) \longrightarrow \prod_{n \in \mathbb{N}^*} \mathcal{T}(G, Z_n) \stackrel{1-shift}{\longrightarrow} \prod_{n \in \mathbb{N}^*} \mathcal{T}(G, Z_n) \to 0.$$

Let $Z = \underleftarrow{\operatorname{holim}}\, Z_n$. We obtain a map $Y \to Z$ which induces an isomorphism $\mathcal{T}(G, Y) \stackrel{\cong}{\longrightarrow} \mathcal{T}(G, Z)$. Complete it to a triangle

$$X \to Y \to Z \to \Sigma X.$$

Since G was arbitrary, we deduce $X \in \mathcal{G}^{\perp}$ and obviously $Z \in \mathcal{U}$. Therefore the triangle above corroborated with [10, Theorem 9.1.13] proves that there is a localization sequence $\mathcal{G}^{\perp} \to \mathcal{T} \to \mathcal{U}$. Finally supposing $Y \in \mathcal{U}$ this forces $X \in \mathcal{U}$, because $\mathcal{U}$ is triangulated. Since we have also $X \in \mathcal{G}^{\perp}$ we infer $X = 0$, thus $Y \cong Z = \underleftarrow{\operatorname{holim}}\, Z_n \in \operatorname{Coloc}(\mathcal{C})$, hence $\mathcal{U} = \operatorname{Coloc}(\mathcal{C})$ is $\mathcal{S}$–cofiltered and all we need is to apply Proposition 1.1. □

Corollary 1.6. *Assume that $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathcal{T}$ and $\mathcal{G} \subseteq \mathcal{T}$ are two Σ-stable sets, such that there is $s \in \mathbb{N}^*$ with the property $\Psi(\mathcal{S})^s \subseteq \Phi(\mathcal{G})$, and assume also that $\mathcal{G}$ generates $\mathcal{T}$. Then $\mathcal{T} = \operatorname{Coloc}(\mathcal{C})$ and $\mathcal{T}^o$ satisfies Brown representability.*

Proof. The hypothesis $\mathcal{G}$ generates $\mathcal{T}$ means $\mathcal{G}^{\perp} = \{0\}$. Thus apply Theorem 1.5 with $\mathcal{U} = \left(\mathcal{G}^{\perp}\right)^{\perp} = \mathcal{T}$. □

Corollary 1.7. *Let $\mathcal{G} \subseteq \mathcal{T}$ a Σ-stable set and denote $\mathcal{U} = \left(\mathcal{G}^{\perp}\right)^{\perp}$. Suppose that there is a Σ-stable set $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathcal{U}$ and an integer $s \in \mathbb{N}^*$ such that $\Psi(\mathcal{C})^s \subseteq \Phi(\mathcal{G})$. Suppose in addition that $\mathcal{T}$ has coproducts and there is a localization sequence $\mathrm{Loc}(\mathcal{G}) \to \mathcal{T} \to \mathcal{G}^{\perp}$. Then $\mathrm{Loc}(\mathcal{G})$ is equivalent to $\mathcal{U}$ and, consequently, $\mathrm{Loc}(\mathcal{G})^o$ satisfies Brown representability. In particular, this is true if objects in $\mathcal{G}$ are α-compact, for a regular cardinal α.*

Proof. The localization sequences $\mathrm{Loc}(\mathcal{G}) \to \mathcal{T} \to \mathcal{G}^{\perp}$ and $\mathcal{G}^{\perp} \to \mathcal{T} \to \mathcal{U}$ show that both categories $\mathrm{Loc}(\mathcal{G})$ and $\mathcal{U}$ are equivalent to the Verdier quotient $\mathcal{T}/\mathcal{G}^{\perp}$, hence they are equivalent to each other. According to [10, Theorem 8.4.2], $\mathrm{Loc}(\mathcal{G})$ satisfies Brown representability, provided that objects in $\mathcal{G}$ are α-compact. Consequently the inclusion functor $\mathrm{Loc}(\mathcal{G}) \to \mathcal{T}$ which preserves coproducts must have a right adjoint and a localization sequence $\mathrm{Loc}(\mathcal{G}) \to \mathcal{T} \to \mathcal{G}^{\perp}$ exists. □

Finally let observe that the general version of Brown representability for covariant functors proved in [4] is a consequence of our criterion. In order to do that, let $\mathcal{T}$ be a triangulated category with products and coproducts. Recall from [4, Definition 2] that a *set of symmetric generators* for $\mathcal{T}$ is a set $\mathcal{G} \subseteq \mathcal{T}$ which generates $\mathcal{T}$ such that and there is another set $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathcal{T}$ with the property that for every map $X \to Y$ in $\mathcal{T}$ the induced map $\mathcal{T}(G, X) \to \mathcal{T}(G, Y)$ is surjective for all $G \in \mathcal{G}$ if and only if the induced map $\mathcal{T}(Y, C) \to \mathcal{T}(X, C)$ is injective for all $C \in \mathcal{C}$. Completing the map $X \to Y$ to a triangle it is easy to see that the last condition is equivalent to the fact $\Phi(\mathcal{G}) = \Psi(\mathcal{C})$. Remark also that without losing the generality, we may suppose the sets $\mathcal{G}$ and $\mathcal{C}$ to be Σ-closed. Applying Corollary 1.6 we obtain:

Corollary 1.8. [4, Theorem B] *If $\mathcal{T}$ has products, coproducts and a set of symmetric generators, then $\mathcal{T}^o$ satisfies Brown representability.*

Remark also that hypotheses in [4, Theorem B] are general enough to include the case of a compactly generated category.

2. Applications: Homotopy categories of projective modules and of projective complexes

Let $\mathcal{A}$ be an additive category. *Complexes (cohomologically graded)* over $\mathcal{A}$ are sequences of the form

$$X = \cdots \to X^{n-1} \xrightarrow{d^{n-1}} X^n \xrightarrow{d^n} X^{n+1} \to \cdots$$

with $X^n \in \mathcal{A}$, $n \in \mathbb{Z}$, and $d^n d^{n-1} = 0$; these morphisms are called *differentials*. Morphisms of complexes are collections of morphisms in $\mathcal{A}$ commuting with differentials. In this way complexes over $\mathcal{A}$ form a category denoted $\mathbf{C}(\mathcal{A})$. Limits and colimits in the category $\mathbf{C}(\mathcal{A})$ are computed component–wise, provided that the respective constructions may be performed in $\mathcal{A}$. In particular $\mathbf{C}(\mathcal{A})$ is abelian (Grothendieck) if $\mathcal{A}$ is so.

Two maps of complexes $(f^n)_{n\in\mathbb{Z}}, (g^n)_{n\in\mathbb{Z}} : X \to Y$ are homotopically equivalent if there are $s^n : X^n \to Y^{n-1}$, for all $n \in \mathbb{Z}$, such that $f^n - g^n = d_Y^{n-1}s^n + s^{n+1}d_X^n$. The homotopy category $\mathbf{K}(\mathcal{A})$ has as objects all complexes and as morphisms equivalence classes of morphisms of complexes

up to homotopy. It is well–known that $\mathbf{K}(\mathcal{A})$ is a triangulated category with (co)products, provided that the same property is valid for $\mathcal{A}$.

In the sequel, the category $\mathcal{A}$ will be often an additive exact (that is closed under extensions) subcategory of the category Mod-R of modules over a ring R, associative with one. (Our modules are right modules by default.) For example, $\mathcal{A}$ may be Flat-R of Proj-R the full subcategories of all flat, respectively projective modules. Another source of examples is the subcategory of projective complexes over a module category R, that is Proj-$\mathbf{C}(R)$. Note then that if $\mathcal{A} \subseteq$ Mod-R or $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathbf{C}$(Mod-$R$) an additive exact category as above, then $\mathbf{K}(\mathcal{A})$ is triangulated subcategory of $\mathbf{K}$(Mod-R) respectively $\mathbf{K}(\mathbf{C}$(Mod-R)).

The general argument in the Section above is obtained by formalization of [8], where the main result is that the homotopy category of projective modules satisfies Brown representability for covariant functors. Consequently it is not surprisingly at all that an application of Section 1 is:

Theorem 2.1. [8, Theorem 1] *The homotopy category of projective modules satisfies Brown representability for covariant functors.*

Proof. We only have to verify that the assumptions made in Corollary 1.7 are fulfilled. Fix a ring R and denote $\mathcal{T} = \mathbf{K}$(Flat-R) (modules are right by default). Let $\mathcal{G}$ be the closure under Σ of the generating set for $\mathbf{K}$(Proj-R) defined in [12, Construction 4.3] of [14, Reminder 1.5]. According to [12, Theorem 5.9], $\mathcal{G}$ is a a set of $\aleph_1$-compact generators for $\mathbf{K}$(Proj-R). Denote $\mathcal{U} = \left(\mathcal{G}^{\perp}\right)^{\perp}$. Further let $\mathcal{C}$ be the closure under Σ of the set with elements $J(\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathbb{Z}}(I, \mathbb{Q}/\mathbb{Z}))$ where I runs over all *text-complexes* of (left) R-modules in the sense of [14, Definition 1.1], and $J : \mathbf{K}$(Mod-R) $\to \mathbf{K}$(Flat-R) $= \mathcal{T}$ is the right adjoint of the inclusion functor $\mathbf{K}$(Flat-R) $\to \mathbf{K}$(Mod-R). By [14, Lemma 2.6], we have $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathcal{U}$. According to [14, Lemma 2.8], $\Phi(\mathcal{C})$ contains exactly the so called *tensor-phantom* map in the sense of [14, Definition 1.3]. Finally $\Psi(\mathcal{C})^2 \subseteq \Phi(\mathcal{G})$, as [14, Lemma 1.9] states. Therefore Corollary 1.7 applies, hence $\mathbf{K}$(Proj-R) $= \mathrm{Loc}(\mathcal{G})$ satisfies Brown representability for covariant functors. □

For the next Lemma we need more notations. We continue to fix a triangulated category with products $\mathcal{T}$. We suppose we are in the same context as in Corollary 1.7, that is $\mathcal{G} \subseteq \mathcal{T}$ is Σ-stable set, $\mathcal{U} = \left(\mathcal{G}^{\perp}\right)^{\perp}$ and there is a Σ-stable set $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathcal{U}$ and an integer $s \in \mathbb{N}^*$ such that $\Psi(\mathcal{C})^s \subseteq \Phi(\mathcal{G})$. Moreover, there is a localization sequence $\mathrm{Loc}(\mathcal{G}) \to \mathcal{T} \to \mathcal{G}^{\perp}$. We denote $\mathcal{L} = \mathrm{Loc}(\mathcal{G})$ and by $I : \mathcal{L} \to \mathcal{T}$ the inclusion functor, which has, by assumption a right adjoint $I_{\rho} : \mathcal{T} \to \mathcal{L}$. As we have seen there is a localization sequence $\mathcal{G}^{\perp} \to \mathcal{T} \to \mathcal{U}$, so the canonical functor $Q : \mathcal{T} \to \mathcal{U}$ has a right adjoint, namely the inclusion functor $Q_{\rho} : \mathcal{U} \to \mathcal{T}$. Denote $\bar{\mathcal{C}} = I_{\rho}Q_{\rho}(\mathcal{C}) \in \mathcal{L}$ and remind that $\Phi_{\mathcal{L}}(\mathcal{G})$ and $\Psi_{\mathcal{L}}(\bar{\mathcal{C}})$ are the ideals of all maps in $\mathcal{L}$ which are $\mathcal{G}$-phantoms, respectively $\bar{\mathcal{C}}$-cophantoms.

Lemma 2.2. *With the above assumptions and notations we have* $\Phi_{\mathcal{L}}(\mathcal{G}) = \Phi_{\mathcal{T}}(\mathcal{G}) \cap \mathcal{L}$ *and* $\Psi_{\mathcal{L}}(\bar{\mathcal{C}}) = \Psi_{\mathcal{T}}(\mathcal{C}) \cap \mathcal{L}$. *In particular* $\Phi_{\mathcal{L}}(\bar{\mathcal{C}})^s \subseteq \Phi_{\mathcal{L}}(\mathcal{G})$.

Proof. For the maps ϕ and ψ in $\mathcal{L}$, we have

$$\phi \in \Phi_{\mathcal{L}}(\mathcal{G}) \Leftrightarrow \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{G}, \phi) = 0 \Leftrightarrow \mathcal{T}(I(\mathcal{G}), I(\phi)) = 0 \Leftrightarrow \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{G}, \phi) = 0$$

and

$$\psi \in \Psi_{\mathcal{L}}(\bar{\mathcal{C}}) \Leftrightarrow \mathcal{L}(\psi, \bar{\mathcal{C}}) = 0 \Leftrightarrow \mathcal{L}(\psi, I_\rho Q_\rho(\mathcal{C})) = 0$$
$$\Leftrightarrow \mathcal{T}(I(\phi), Q_\rho(\mathcal{C})) = 0 \Leftrightarrow \mathcal{T}(\psi, \mathcal{C}) = 0.$$

□

Proposition 2.3. *Suppose $F : \mathcal{T}' \to \mathcal{T}$ is a triangulated functor which has both a left and a right adjoint denoted by $L, R : \mathcal{T} \to \mathcal{T}'$. If there are Σ-stable sets $\mathcal{G} \subseteq \mathcal{T}$ and $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathcal{T}$ and $s \in \mathbb{N}^*$ with the property $\Psi_{\mathcal{T}}(\mathcal{S})^s \subseteq \Phi_{\mathcal{T}}(\mathcal{G})$, then*

$$\Psi_{\mathcal{T}'}(R(\mathcal{C}))^s \subseteq \Phi_{\mathcal{T}'}(L(\mathcal{G})).$$

In particular, if $\mathcal{T}' = \mathrm{Loc}(L(\mathcal{G}))$ then $\mathcal{T}'$ satisfies Brown representability for covariant functors.

Proof. The sets $L(\mathcal{G}) \subseteq \mathcal{T}'$ and $R(\mathcal{C}) \subseteq \mathcal{T}'$ are clearly Σ-closed. For the maps ϕ and ψ in $\mathcal{T}'$ we have

$$\phi \in \Phi_{\mathcal{T}'}(L(\mathcal{G})) \Leftrightarrow \mathcal{T}'(L(\mathcal{G}), \phi) = 0 \Leftrightarrow \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{G}, F(\phi)) = 0 \Leftrightarrow F(\phi) \in \Phi_{\mathcal{T}}(\mathcal{G})$$

and

$$\psi \in \Psi_{\mathcal{T}'}(R(\mathcal{C})) \Leftrightarrow \mathcal{T}'(\psi, R(\mathcal{C})) = 0 \Leftrightarrow \mathcal{T}(F(\psi), \mathcal{C}) = 0 \Leftrightarrow F(\phi) \in \Phi_{\mathcal{T}}(\mathcal{C}).$$

Therefore $\Psi_{\mathcal{T}'}(R(\mathcal{C}))^s \subseteq \Phi_{\mathcal{T}'}(L(\mathcal{G}))$ and if, in addition, $\mathcal{T}' = \mathrm{Loc}(L(\mathcal{G}))$ then Corollary 1.6 applies in order to show that $\mathcal{T}'$ satisfies Brown representability for covariant functors. □

Theorem 2.4. *The homotopy category of projective complexes of modules satisfies Brown representability for covariant functors.*

Proof. Adopt the notations made in the proof of Theorem 2.1. In addition denote by $\mathcal{T}' = \mathbf{K}(\text{Proj-}\mathbf{C}(R))$ the homotopy category of projective complexes of R-modules and by $\mathcal{L} = \mathbf{K}(\text{Proj-}R)$. According to [1, 2.10], the evaluation functor $(-)^0 : \mathbf{C}(\text{Proj-}\mathbf{C}(R)) \to \mathbf{C}(\text{Proj-}R)$ extends to a triangulated functor $F : \mathcal{T}' \to \mathcal{L}$ which has both a right and a left adjoint $L, R : \mathcal{L} \to \mathcal{T}'$. Moreover the argument used in [1, Theorem 3.5 and Corollary 3.6] may be used in order to show that $\mathcal{T}' = \mathrm{Loc}(L(\mathcal{G}))$. (We asked here the Σ-closure of the sets $\mathcal{G}$ and $\mathcal{C}$ instead to work with all evaluation functors $(-)^n : \mathbf{C}(\text{Proj-}\mathbf{C}(R)) \to \mathbf{C}(\text{Proj-}R)$, for all $n \in \mathbb{Z}$). Finally note that Lemma 2.2 there are Σ-stable sets $\mathcal{G}$ and $\bar{\mathcal{C}}$ in $\mathcal{L}$ such that $\Phi_{\mathcal{L}}(\bar{\mathcal{C}})^2 \subseteq \Phi_{\mathcal{L}}(\mathcal{G})$. Therefore the hypotheses of Proposition 2.3 are satisfied, and the conclusion follows. □

References

[1] J. Asadollahi, R. Hafezi, S. Salarian, *Homotopy category of projective complexes and complexes of Gorenstein projective modules*, J. Algebra, **399** (2014), 423–444.

[2] E. H. Brown, *Cohomology theories*, Annals Math., **75** (1962), 467–484.

[3] R. Göbel, J. Trlifaj, *Approximations and Endomorphisms Algebras of Modules*, De Gruyter Expositions in Mathematics, **41**, Walter de Gruyter, 2006.

[4] H. Krause, *A Brown representability theorem via coherent functors*, Topology **41** (2002), 853-861.

[5] G. C. Modoi, *On perfectly generating projective classes in triangulated categories*, Comm. Algebra, **38** (2010), 995–1011.

[6] G. C. Modoi, *The dual of Brown representability for homotopy categories of complexes*, J. Algebra, **392** (2013), 115–124.

[7] G. C. Modoi, *The dual of Brown representability for some derived categories*, preprint arXiv:1305.6028[math.CT].
[8] G. C. Modoi, *The dual of the homotopy category of projectives modules satisfies Brown representability*, preprint arXiv:1308.0113[math.CT] (to appear, Bull. LMS).
[9] G. C. Modoi and J. Šťovíček, Brown representability often fails for homotopy categories of complexes, *J. K-Theory*, **9** (2012), 151–160.
[10] A. Neeman, *Triangulated Categories*, Annals of Mathematics Studies, **148**, Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 2001.
[11] A. Neeman, *Brown Representability follows from Rosický's theorem*, J. Topology, **2** (2009), 262–276.
[12] A. Neeman, *The homotopy category of flat modules, and Grothendieck duality*, Invent. Math., **174** (2008), 255–308.
[13] A. Neeman, *Some adjoints in homotopy categories*, Ann. Math., **171** (2010), 2142–2155.
[14] A. Neeman, *Explicit cogenerators for the homotopy category of projective modules over a ring*, Ann. Sci. Éc. Norm. Sup., **44** (2011), 607–629.

Babeş–Bolyai University, Faculty of Mathematics and Computer Science, 1, Mihail Kogălniceanu, 400084 Cluj–Napoca, Romania
E-mail address: cmodoi@math.ubbcluj.ro